



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CM

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/668,105	09/22/2000	Chen Feng	TELNP215US	9584
7590 03/18/2004			EXAMINER	
Himanshu S Amin Esq Amin Eschweiler & Turocy LLP 24th Floor National City Center 1900 East 9th Street Cleveland, OH 44114			SHAHER, RICKY D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2872	
DATE MAILED: 03/18/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

09668,105

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKETT NO.
---------------	-------------	-----------------------	----------------------

EXAMINER
----------

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

DATE MAILED:

### EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) MR. ERIC JORGENSEN (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) R.D. SHAFER (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of interview 02/20/2004

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☐ No. If yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Agreement ☐ was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. ☒ was not reached.

Claims discussed: 22

Identification of prior art discussed: SHEPARD (1711), OGURA ETAL (1560) & TANIGUCHI ETAL (1287)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: DURING A TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW WITH MR. JORGENSEN, THE EXAMINER AND MR. JORGENSEN DISCUSSED IN GREAT DETAIL THE ABOVE MENTIONED PRIOR ART AND A PROPOSED AMENDMENT WHICH WAS E-MAILED TO THE EXAMINER ON 2/19/2004. THE EXAMINER STATED THAT THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT MADE SUBSTANTIAL CHANGES TO THE CLAIMS AND THAT SUCH CHANGES IF APPROVED OFFICIALLY FILED WOULD NOT BE ENTERED DUE TO THE FACT THAT SUCH CHANGES WOULD PRESENT NEW ISSUES REQUIRING FURTHER CONSIDERATION/SEARCH. HOWEVER, THE EXAMINER STATED THAT SUCH CHANGES WOULD APPEAR FROM A CURSORY REVIEW. MAY DISTINGUISH OVER SHEPARD AND TANIGUCHI ETAL BUT WOULD REQUIRE FURTHER SUBSTANTIAL ADDITIONAL CHANGES TO OVERCOME THE OGURA ETAL REFERENCE.  
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

☒ 1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph below has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 on the reverse side of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

☐ 2. Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the substance of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's Signature